

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Remarks regarding the amendments

Claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 3-7 have been canceled and replaced with claims 8-14 because in the original claim set two claims were labeled claim 3 and claim 4 depended from itself. Some small changes in phrasing to improve clarity and due to the cancellation of claim 1 have also been included.

The new claim set has the following general correspondence to the original claim set

<u>New claim</u>	<u>Original claim</u>
8	first claim 3
9	second claim 3
10	4
11	5
12	5 (different dependency)
13	6
14	7

Response to the Restriction requirement

The Office issues a restriction requirement between group 1 (claims to monomers) and group 2 (claims to polymer compositions made from those monomers). Applicants elect with traverse group 1 (now claims 2, and 8-10).

The rationale for the restriction was that claim 1 lacked novelty over US 2003/0165265, formula 1 and therefore there is no special technical feature between groups 1 and 2. Applicants assert that this basis for restriction is improper. First, the monomers of group 1 are in fact not disclosed by formula 1 of the cited reference. Formula 1 of the reference shows a compound having only phenylethynyl groups. The present monomers require the presence of both aryethynyl groups and ethynyl groups lacking a pendant aryl group. Therefore the statement that this is not a special technical feature is not proper and groups 1 and 2 should be rejoined.

In addition, since group 2 is claimed as being defined as a polymer compositions made from the monomers of group 1, by definition the search for group 2 is going to be the same as the search for group 1 and not burdensome to the examiner.

The applicants, therefore, request withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of all pending claims.

Response to Election of Species

The Examiner also required an election of species from amongst those species of claim 4 (now claim 10). Applicants elect with traverse the second formula shown in original claim 4 and also shown in Example 1 at page 28. This species is within the scope of claims 2, 9, and 10 and is used in making the polymer compositions of claims 11-14. Applicants traverse on the basis that the compounds of claim 10 are sufficiently similar that it would not be burdensome to search all of these together.

Respectfully submitted,

/Susan Moeller Zerull/

Susan Moeller Zerull
Registration No. 38,367
Phone: 989-636-8858

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

SMZ/srl